

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/847,395	05/03/2001	Marc M. Rehfeld	206748US3	6479
22850	7590 08/06/2003			
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER	
			FERGUSON, LAWRENCE D	
ALEXANDI	un, vn 22514			·
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1774	14
			DATE MAILED: 08/06/2003	, ,

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/847,395	REHFELD ET AL.	
Advisory Assert	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lawrence D Ferguson	1774	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 24 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offit timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing in FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approperture of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final	on. See MPEP copriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>Se</u>		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3 and 7</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	,	
10.⊠ Other: Claims 4-6 and 8 are cancelled			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues the cited references do not disclose an intermediate layer having a thickness that is dependent upon a critical energy value specific to a material of the intermediate layer and representative of an energy necessary for propagation of a crack initiated in the intermediate layer. Examiner maintains the thickness of the intermediate layer is optimizable and directly affects the damping property of the laminated glass pane. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the intermediate layer because discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 USPQ 215.

CYNTHIA H. KELLY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700